DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 266 LI 001 602

By-Wasserman, Paul

A Report on the Need for Additional Programs in Library Education at the Graduate Level in the Publicly Supported Higher Education System of the State of Ohio.

Ohio Board of Regents, Columbus.

Pub Date 16 Jun 69

Note-21p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.15

Descriptors-*Graduate Study, *Information Science, *Library Education, *Library Schools, Library Science, *State Universities

Identifiers-*Ohio

This report contains recommendations concerning the need for additional opportunities in Ohio for graduate study in library science, as well as the probable location and the appropriate kinds of program emphasis for a new library school. The study considers the following campuses of Ohio's state-assisted university system: Kent State University, Toledo University, Bowling Green University, University of Cincinnati, Wright State University, Ohio State University. The criteria used in comparing new sites include the existence of other graduate programs and research efforts, the potential hierarchical position for a projected program in relation to the graduate school, the attitudes of the university's administration toward the development of librarianship, the demonstrated capacity of the institution to attract well-qualified faculty members, the computer center facilities, the library facilities, and others. The report reviews the visits to each institution and discusses the program opportunities at each. The conclusions provide recommendations for establishing the new library school at Ohio State University and proposals for further development of library education in Ohio. (RM)

ED 031266

LI 001602

A Report on the Need for Additional Programs in Library Education at the Graduate Level in the Publicly Supported Higher Education System of the State of Ohio

by

PAUL WASSERMAN
Dean, School of Library and Information Services
University of Maryland

for

The Board of Regents of the State of Ohio

ERIC/CLIS
JUL 25 '69
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

June 16, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LI 001602

Introduction

The proposal "... to make further recommendations about the need for an additional School of Library Science, the location for such a School, and the kind of program emphasis which would be appropriate for such a school.",[1] was first made to the writer by Dr. John D. Millett, Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, in October 1968. The rationale for an analysis which would lead to such recommendation grew out of the suggestion contained in the 1966 Master Plan for public higher education in Ohio, in which "one additional graduate school or program in library science in Ohio" was recommended.

As consultant to the Board of Regents, the writer conducted his review of such prospects between February and June 1969, through site visits and on-the-scene discussions with concerned and interested faculty and administrators in the Ohio higher education system of state assisted institutions. The effort was not conceived as a research task. Supply and demand requirements for professional librarians in Ohio had already been studied by Dr. Philip Ennis in Ohio Library Manpower: A Statistical Report.[2] During the course of the analysis, visits were made to the following campuses of the state-assisted university system of Ohio: Kent

---

[1] In a letter dated October 31, 1968.

[2] Philip H. Ennis, Ohio Library Manpower: A Statistical Report (submitted to Professor Ralph Blasingame, as part of the Ohio public libraries and state library services survey, 1968).

State University, Toledo University, Bowling Green University, University of Cincinnati, Wright State University, Ohio State University. The thoughtfulness and considerate arrangements made by academic administrators, library staffs, faculty and other university officials was universal. Everyone who was met spoke openly and with candor of the educational need and perspectives, and when in a policy determining role, about the disposition of the institution to engage upon a program of library education. The analysis and the recommendations which grow out of it would have been impossible without this cooperation.

This report shall take the form of a review of the main points elicited in the course of visiting and discussing program opportunities at each institution. The conclusions summarize the recommendations and propose next steps in the development of further library education in Ohio.

Background

The Manpower research evidence recently accumulated for Ohio by Ennis[3], left unnecessary the analytic process of screening intelligence. The case for increased numbers of professionally prepared personnel for Ohio libraries had already been made. A primary consideration, however was the need to establish the criteria to be used in comparing new sites

---

[3] Philip H. Ennis, Ibid.

for graduate study in librarianship. Educational characteristics were obviously relevant, but geographic factors seem equally germane. The nature of graduate professional education for librarianship, and its capacity to attract sufficient numbers to sustain a program at a level of quality and scale, appears irrevocably tied to a location in an urban center which offers the population base and the laboratory opportunity for a variety of experiential settings where practice and research may be observed, analyzed, and assessed. It is for this reason that the present analysis considered most seriously only those institutions located in or contiguous to highly populated urban centers.

The university context is obviously the paramount concern. Because the strength of contemporary library education as an emergent discipline is conditioned in many ways by its interdisciplinary relationships, the existence of other graduate programs and research efforts, genuine interest and a climate of colleague concern in those areas germane to librarianship, rank as significant factors. Organizational placement, that is, the potential hierarchical position for a projected program in relation to the graduate school, and to the other professional schools is another element. The attitudes of the university's administration toward librarianship as a field worthy of development so as to ensure the priority needed to sustain and encourage a new program, obviously is central. The demonstrated capacity of an institution to attract well-qualified and committed

faculty members of scholarly distinction, by affording the incentives of prestige and economic prerogatives must also be available. Modern library education clearly requires an academic culture in which experimental and interdisciplinary programs receive hospitality from the institution without suspicion or bureaucratic constraint. The availability of a university library of scale and scope so as not to delimit opportunity for students and faculty is another essential. Computer center facilities, multi-media arrangements in the university, and information centers and research organizations as part of the academic and community ambience, all rank as significant contemporary requisites. The disposition and the capacity of the institution to provide suitable quarters and accommodations for a faculty, a staff, and a student body which need to develop their own integrity are also essential. It was these issues, in the main, which were explored during the analysis.

Field work followed review and analysis of published data on manpower requirements in the state and of the documentary background on each institution's history of interest in library education.[4] Arrangements for campus visits were made with senior administrative officers, normally the President or the Vice-President's Office, and interviews were organized with members of the administrative staff, the faculty, the library officers, as well as professionals in the community who had expressed an interest or

---

[4] Useful suggestions were received in discussions with Chancellor Millett and State Librarian, Joseph F. Shubert, in mid February, during a visit to Columbus in advance of the field visits.

played an active role in representation of need for library education programs. Two fully accredited graduate schools of librarianship exist in Ohio and it is necessary to consider them in a review of projected expansion. One is at Case Western Reserve University, and since this is a privately supported institution, it has not been studied within the framework of the present analysis (except to note that its master's degree graduates have been increasing during the last few years). The other is Kent State University.

The crucial issue here was the anticipated degree of expansion which was being planned.[5] The account which follows details the observations and perceptions based upon site visits to each of the institutions included in the analysis.

Kent State University School of Library Science

The pattern at Kent State suggests that while the School has been accredited for several years, it is only in the last year or two that the

---

[5] A subtle factor which conditions the need for greater scale of development in librarianship, is that without size there is foreclosed the prospect of diversity in faculty in those specialized areas which in combination make for competency in a contemporary program. An expansive program builds faculty strength while maintaining reasonable faculty/student relationships, thereby increasing the prospect of specialization, variable points of view and expertise. In a time when librarianship is experiencing a dramatic metamorphosis in its intellectual and applied concerns, a certain scale of size well beyond the earlier acceptable five or six faculty members becomes imperative. This results from the fact that librarianship in its nature is now comprehending newer disciplines and these must be reflected in the curriculum and the research perspectives of a modern school. The social sciences and the information sciences - the organizational, the clientele, the technological, and the processing concerns of libraries have come to be essential elements of the modern program. A broader based faculty with varied qualifications, research competency and experience are all needed.

expansion in its scale has reached a point where significantly increased numbers of students are being prepared. In the fall of 1966, forty-eight graduate students were in attendance, in the fall of 1967, fifty-nine, by the fall of 1968, eighty-five were in attendance. The number of master's degrees awarded was twelve in 1967, and thirty-two in 1968. The scale of the program is such that it could not possibly be expected to assume solely the statewide responsibility for offering library education at the master's level in the state's public higher education system. An essential strength of the Kent program as viewed by its own faculty is the relationship between the undergraduate (in relation to the College of Education) and the graduate programs. This is seen more as advantage than as disadvantage. The scale of financial support for the program has been increased, with the primary emphasis centered in the field of school libraries where this School has its most longstanding commitments and the greatest concentration in students and faculty. The faculty composition in 1968/69 included eight full-time, one part-time and one vacancy. The goal for academic year 1971/72 is twelve full-time faculty members and a doctoral program is planned.

Essentially, Kent State University offers a traditional program in librarianship. It has begun a Center for Library Studies, but the degree of involvement of the School in the research base of the university and in crossing into disciplines which appear promising for librarianship, is at a very early stage. The School has received encouragement and support from its university administration and in discussions with administrative officers,

including Dr. Harris, Vice-President and Provost, Dr. Hall, Assistant Provost, and Dr. McGrath, Dean of the Graduate School, it was clear that there was a disposition to provide support for the further development of the program. The pace of development at Kent, however, is gradual. No dramatic shift in its expansion seems sought or appears realistically in prospect.

It must be pointed out, however, that to consider a new program for the State without simultaneously encouraging Kent State University to expand gradually through the provision of adequate resources, would be ill-advised. The anticipated move by the School into quarters in the new library during the coming months will enhance its prospects. The space now designated for the School's program in this building, however, reflects the modest growth envisaged and reinforces the case for need of additional state-supported opportunity in library education.

University of Toledo

At the University of Toledo, a program of some thirty years' standing is being continued. As a marginal program, it serves only a very limited local purpose. For a number of years, the director of the library was also director of the program of library education. The School has evolved in the mold characteristic of library education in its more pragmatic earlier stages. With the retirement of the incumbent director now imminent, the opportunity for adaptation and variation in program and perspective is possible.

Discussions with the present director of the library suggest that he is attempting within the constraints of the institution, his library administrative responsibility, and the availability of resources from the administration, to adapt and modify the library education program in order to strive for ultimate accreditation.

But, in a time when competition for individuals to provide program direction is exceedingly keen, the likelihood of attracting a first-rate person to Toledo to provide such direction is not good.

Moreover, in discussions with university officers at Toledo, while it was clear that library education continues to be of marginal interest, that the existing offering is not in jeopardy, neither is there enthusiasm nor priority for a more effective or better supported program in the field. University officials seem interested in giving help to the present director of the library so that the program can be continued and improved somewhat, but in a time when institutional commitments are many and where resources are zealously competed for, it was clear that Toledo was not committed to graduate education in librarianship which might lead to accreditation. At best, genuine promise for library education can be seen only as a potentially long-term prospect.

One avenue which seems worthy of exploration is the potential for a cooperative program between Toledo University and Bowling Green University. Interest in such a possibility was expressed by Toledo library and administrative officials, as well as those with whom discussions were

held at Bowling Green. Administrative officers of these institutions seemed prepared to enter into discussions which might lead to a cooperative program, building upon the strong library resources and experience at Toledo, and the school and school library orientation of Bowling Green. While library education in neither institution appeared to have a priority of any kind, the potential for a cooperative arrangement appeared to elicit genuine interest.

Bowling Green University

At Bowling Green, no library official or administrative officer sought the addition of graduate work in librarianship. The course work now provided constitutes an undergraduate major or a graduate minor for library science people. These tend almost exclusively to be students in the College of Education. At Bowling Green, the idea of a potential cooperative program ultimately between Toledo University and Bowling Green was received with interest. The strength was seen as that of Toledo's inner city opportunity and Bowling Green's strong College of Education. At Bowling Green, the pressure for master's work in librarianship, comes basically from the need to accommodate students in the College of Education. But, the faculty is very limited and its perspectives are heavily oriented to school librarianship.

In a study conducted by Dr. Louis Shores, a consultant to the College of Education in 1966, there was the recommendation that the program

in the College of Education work toward evolving a program of graduate study, ultimately to become a fully accredited program. It was suggested then that explorations for combined work with Toledo University be considered.

Bowling Green's work in the College of Education at the undergraduate level is like the course work offered all over the country. Colleges of Education have on their faculties, one, sometimes two or three individuals, who offer specialized courses leading to minors in library science for teachers. Such course work is accredited only in the state in which the course work is taken. But, since professional standing in librarianship is a condition of receiving a master's degree from an accredited graduate program, ultimately the continuing validity of such offerings without the further option of graduate study comes into question. At Bowling Green, the prospect of graduate education leading to accreditation had not ever been seriously considered, nor is it likely to be in the near future. However, since both Toledo University and Bowling Green University express interest in exploring the possibility of combining their efforts in a common program at the graduate level, encouragement by the Board of Regents to these institutions to conduct such discussions would doubtless facilitate the process and is recommended.

The University of Cincinnati

The prime movers at the University of Cincinnati behind the impetus for library education were a University committee in which the

former librarian at the University had been chairman. The public library interests had often and clearly expressed themselves as being in favor of the development of a graduate program in librarianship at Cincinnati and the public library director had served on the University committee. The members of the committee which had prepared a report and proposal for the development of graduate library education at Cincinnati met with the analyst and expressed their continued interest. The public library enthusiasm for the program remains undiminished.

In discussions with administrative officers of the University, it was apparent that Cincinnati had higher priorities than the development of graduate library education. The position of President Langsam was clearly that "If someone endowed it or if there were some way of subsidizing the program effectively on a per student basis", Cincinnati might be interested. The feeling of the President and other senior administrative officers was that the institution had the potential for such a program, but that the pressures and the costs to improve other disciplines put library education at a low level of priority. Without significant support and encouragement, and the assurance of adequate resources into the future, no responsible University official was seriously interested in adding this element to the academic constellation.

In discussing the prospects for library education with administrative officers at Cincinnati, Wright State was identified by them as a perhaps more

likely center for such a development since it was more clearly oriented toward new programs and librarianship had been specified by them as a field of genuine interest. Yet, because Cincinnati has a long academic history, a well developed research library of standing and reputation, and because of the institution's location in the center of a heavily populated urban area, the question was raised with them about possible interest in a joint development with Wright State. There was clear interest expressed in this possibility. A precedent already existed for working with another institution on a joint basis in the development of degree work, and the same was seen as a reasonable possibility in librarianship. All the senior academic officials with whom this was discussed, indicated that they would be genuinely interested in such discussions with Wright State University and encouraged the analyst to take up the question during a subsequent visit to Wright State.

Wright State University

At Wright State University, there was keen enthusiasm about the prospect of library education, on the part of the library staff and administrative officers, related faculty departments, as well as on the part of President Golding. The nature of the institution and of its programs was such that librarianship was seen as highly relevant to many of the other concerns of the University. The commitment here was related to media, with the school media center, at elementary and secondary levels, seen as the central concern. The development of a media specialist program,

conforming to the National Education Association's Department of Audio-visual Instruction standards, and to the Association of American School Librarians standards, was already in progress. Moreover, this educational program was viewed quite imaginatively as one which other campus elements might enjoy and as supportive of course work and needs of students in subject disciplines other than librarianship.

The concentration upon media instruction, within a framework of librarianship offers lively possibilities and is an original orientation, uncommon to traditional library education. At Kent State, for example, the media elements have not yet been drawn fully into perspective. Given the enthusiasm and the momentum reflected in all the conversations held at Wright State, it seems clear that in a short span of years this institution will be ready to contribute significantly to graduate professional education for librarianship. However, it does not yet seem ready to assume the burden of becoming in the immediate future the second state-supported graduate library program in the state. Moreover, present limited resources of the library and a location in the outer suburb of Dayton, are obvious limiting factors. Clearly the program fully deserves encouragement, however.

Having raised the question in discussions with officials at Cincinnati University, the idea of a potential joint program was discussed also at Wright State. Both the President and the Director of the Library suggested that

they would be very interested in pursuing such a line of discussion with officials at Cincinnati. Even so, it was clear that Wright State was planning to go forward with its own media education program whether or not the University was to be designated as a new graduate library program for the state or not.

Given the relative newness of the entire program and of the library and media portions within it, it seems eminently reasonable to encourage Wright State to go forward in discussion with Cincinnati leading to a potential future joint accommodation. While it would be premature to recommend a new program at the two institutions in combination in the the next year, or even two years, within the three to five-year time span, this would seem to offer promise as a potential next stage in the development of library education for the state. The recommendation is for the Board of Regents to encourage the two institutions to form a joint committee to work out in combination a plan for development of a library education program which would build upon the strength and the resources of each and lead ultimately to the acceptance by the faculties of each institution of the program and the awarding of a graduate degree. Between the two institutions the base for research, study, and library resources would in combination be provided. And out of such discussions, a far more promising development could arise than in either of the institutions independently.[6]

---

[6]Parenthetically, it might be stated that at Ball State University in Indiana, a graduate program in library education is now being advanced. This program builds on a longstanding undergraduate sequence, and only recently has begun seriously to strive for accreditation from the American Library Association for its graduate offering.

Ohio State University

At the Ohio State University, the need for gradua study in librarianship had received more serious consideration than at any other institution visited. Committees had been at work over a long period of time. The culmination of these efforts was a document which had been developed by an ad hoc committee and conveyed to the University's decision-making councils during academic year 1968/69. This projected program has now been deferred while a newly constituted committee has been charged with preparing a revised report for consideration no later than November 1,1969. The committee's responsibility includes the recommendation of both the general lines of program content, including its intellectual orientation, and of its organizational placement.

Perceptions gained in discussions at Ohio State University made abundantly clear the fact that a strong climate of sympathy and interest exists at Ohio State University for a graduate program in librarianship. The concerns of the newly constituted committee essentially relate to where the program is to be placed, its depth, and the general arrangements for its development, including its placement and its intellectual orientation. There is strong consensus that the program is needed and that the internal organizational problems can be resolved so that once the program is established, it will receive encouragement and full cooperation from administration, faculty and library interests. There is absolutely no question about the capacity of

Ohio State to support an original and innovative program at the graduate level in librarianship comprehending all of the essential elements necessary to make the program viable professionally, academically respectable, and sufficiently oriented to research perspectives that it would enjoy support and cooperation from all the other relevant disciplines. The Columbus area, given the virtually unrivaled strength of its bibliographic and research context, provides a wide variety of laboratory and research opportunities in the form of the Ohio College Library Center, the State Library, Battelle, Chemical Abstracts, and other like institutions. The population base of the area is such that there would be a large enough community from which to draw students both on a full and part-time basis. Ohio State enjoys national standing and its capacity to draw scholars of distinction is unquestioned. The interest of the administration and of the faculty in the projected new program surpasses that of any of the other institutions visited. Measured by any yardstick, Ohio State standsout as offering the greatest promise and opportunity for developing a new and needed program of merit and substance in librarianship.

To discuss the internal political and substantive differences which relate to program placement at Ohio State would be here inappropriate. The projected program, drawn up by the earlier committee, lacking a research component, would not have been consistent with the Ohio State intellectual culture. Clearly, a program begun around 1970 must calculate as part of its orientation research, laboratory investigation, exploitation and application

of new technology to library problems, administrative and organizational problems of libraries, the utilization of newer media, and sociological and political dimensions of librarianship. The need to commit the program in important measure to administrative concerns as reflected in the early document was noteworthy. But, equally important is the requisite that libraries and librarians understand and exploit the contemporary technology for their purposes.

It is clear that valid arguments can be made to support the location of a new program in librarianship at more than one place on the Ohio State campus. It would be inappropriate for the analyst based upon only the most fragmentary understanding of the university culture, to recommend an ideal placement. However, in view of the site visits, the correspondence, the review of documentary evidence, the current state of representation and proposals, and the disposition of university administrators, Ohio State University is clearly the most appropriate choice. It is therefore proposed that a new program in library education at the graduate level be recommended for establishment at Ohio State University by the Board of Regents. Yet, one more school of librarianship in Ohio, unless it were to be an outstanding and original program bringing to bear in its course work and in its research contribution the most innovative and interdisciplinary thinking, would be unwarranted. It is true that additional numbers would be contributed to a supply now seen as inadequate. But, such needs are now being met by other library education programs around the country. Librarianship does not need

more unimaginative low level operatives to play pedestrian roles in organizations which fail to meet the need of clienteles or the promise of an emergent discipline in a culture growing increasingly more information conscious.

Such a new school would need to draw upon fresh sources of students, from disciplines not always seen as proving grounds for librarianship, to attract them to librarianship by inaugurating imaginative and pioneering efforts tied to related disciplines - computers, administration, educational technology, behavioral science, in an environment hospitable to research, to probing and experimentation, and to the calculation of alternative strategies for librarianship. It is only because Ohio State seems genuinely to afford all of the potential ingredients for such a forward-looking program that it is recommended as such a site. The specific elements of such a program would need to be conditioned by the perspectives of the individual drawn to the University to blueprint the program and by the faculty who would work with him in designing and bringing such a program into being. Ohio State has the capacity and the intellectual resources in its campus and in its immediate environment to engender the most advanced program and to attract excellently qualified students in abundance. What will be needed is imagination and leadership in order to exploit the opportunity. While the manpower problems in the state's library picture seem greatest in school librarianship, to prescribe a new graduate professional and research program oriented exclusively to such concerns would be ill-advised. A narrow or limited

perspective for the new program whatever its constraint, would be inappropriate. There is considerable goodwill on the Ohio State University campus now for the development of the new program. It is hoped that the newly constituted committee, under the chairmanship of Dean Armitage, will make strides in reconciling problems of placement and that it will not prescribe program content beyond the specification of broad areas of relevance. This would have the effect of keeping the options open for the new faculty. It seems feasible that Ohio State could possibly mount a program by academic year 1970/71, or no later than 1971/72. It is strongly recommended to the Board of Regents that the encouragement and support necessary if the program is to be accepted and begun be provided.

Conclusions

(1) It is recommended that a new school of librarianship at the graduate level be established as soon as feasible once a plan has been prepared and accepted by the administration and faculty of the Ohio State University. It is suggested that such a program offer course work leading to the master's degree and ultimately beyond it, to comprehend fully both a professional and research orientation. It is further suggested that it include in its perspective the needs of administration, systems analysis and computers, media concerns, and behavioral elements.

(2) It is recommended that the University of Cincinnati and Wright State University be encouraged to explore possibilities for developing a joint

offering leading to a graduate degree in librarianship based upon a combined academic program between the two institutions. Such a plan might best be developed in order to contemplate a beginning date for such work within the next three to five years.

(3) It is recommended that the University of Toledo and Bowling Green University also be encouraged to consider the long term prospect of developing graduate study in librarianship in combination between the two institutions and that a plan be prepared for consideration with a potential beginning date for such a program contemplated for five to ten years from now.

(4) It is recommended that Kent State University be given full encouragement to continue its expansion and development so that a new program in library education will not be seen as an alternative to its legitimate aspirations to increase its base and to further its projected advance.